

Remarks

As stated above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the following remarks.

In the subject application, claims 1-5 and 24-29 are pending, of which claims 1 and 3 are independent claims, and claims 2, 4, 5, and 24-29 are dependent. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 26, and 29 and added new claims 30-33. Further, Applicants have cancelled claims 25 and 28. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is believed to have been added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1-3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanches (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030018510 hereinafter "Sanches") in view of Kirby et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040024629 hereinafter "Kirby"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, whether viewed separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 1. Applicants' newly amended independent claim 1 is provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:

executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a markup language, the

base system connectors including an interface with remote function call capability; and

displaying a user interface on a computer display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including:

creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force;
generating a schedule for the task force to follow;
generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and
publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders.

(See Applicants' amended claim 1; emphasis added).

As shown above, Applicants' independent claim 1 now recites the limitation “the base system connectors including an interface with *remote function call* capability”. Support for Applicants' amendment to independent claim 1 may be found at least at cancelled dependent claim 25 and paragraph [0066] of the subject application, as published. Paragraph [0066] is provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

[0066] The base system connectors 615 can include an enterprise connector (BC) interface, Internet communication manager/Internet communications framework (ICM/ICF), an encapsulated postscript (EPS) interface and/or other interfaces that provide remote function call (RFC) capability. (See the subject application, as published, paragraph [0066]).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the limitation “the base system connectors including an interface with *remote function call* capability” as recited in Applicants' newly amended claim 1. The Examiner appears to believe that Chatterjee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,162,691 hereinafter “Chatterjee”) disclose this limitation, which was previously presented in claim 25, at column 2, lines 46-57 of Chatterjee. See the subject action, page 9. Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 2, lines 46-57 of Chatterjee are provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

HTML, in its preferred forms, as been defined in specifications which have continued to evolve to meet needs of users and developers. **HTML 2.0 was developed under the aegis of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) to codify common practice in late 1994 and is described in RFC 1866 (November, 1995).** The efforts of the World Wide Web Consortium's HTML Working Group to codify common practice resulted in HTML 3.2 (January 1997). HTML 4.0, the latest version of which is currently available at the URL <http://www.w3.org/TR/html40>, extends HTML with mechanisms for style sheets, scripting, frames, embedding objects, and other enhancements. (*See Chatterjee, as published, column 2, lines 46-57; emphasis added*).

The Examiner appears to believe that because Chatterjee recites "HTML 2.0 was developed under the aegis of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) to codify common practice in late 1994 and is described in *RFC 1866 (November, 1995)*", that Chatterjee teaches or suggests the limitation "the base system connectors including an interface with *remote function call* capability". However, Applicants respectfully submit that the "RFC" referred to by the Examiner stands for *request for comments*, and not *remote function call*, as recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that neither RFC 1866 (November, 1995), which is a memorandum that can be viewed at < <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1866.txt> >, nor Chatterjee, discuss *remote function call* as recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the limitation "the base system connectors including an interface with *remote function call* capability" as recited in Applicants' newly amended claim 1.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicants' amended independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 of the subject application is in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants have amended independent claim 3 to include limitations similar to that of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 3 is in condition for allowance as well. Since the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 or 3, Applicants respectfully submit that those claims are also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants note that claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanches in view of Kirby and further in view of Marpe et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184191 A1 hereinafter “Marpe”) and that claims 24-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanches in view of Kirby and further in view of Chatterjee. Applicants have cancelled claims 25 and 28 and respectfully submit that the rejections to claims 4, 24, 26-27, and 29 are moot in light of the amendment and discussion above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Additionally, Applicants have added new claims 30-33. Applicants’ new claims are provided below for the Examiner’s convenience:

30. (New) A computer program product for facilitating an enterprise change, residing in a computer readable medium, having a plurality of instructions stored thereon, which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:

executing, via two or more source systems represented by a single logical information system, a pre-change due diligence and post-change integration of the enterprise change, the enterprise change being at least one of a merger and acquisition, the source systems interacting with databases through base system connectors using a web service; and

displaying a user interface on a computer display to conduct a merger activity, wherein the user interface includes a project management tab providing features to define a merger and acquisition project from a merger and acquisition template, the features including:

creating a task force and assigning team members to the task force;
generating a schedule for the task force to follow;
generating project proposals to be completed by the task force; and
publishing information about the task force, schedule, and project proposals to one or more stakeholders.

31. (New) The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the web service includes simple object access protocol.

32. (New) The computer program product of claim 30, wherein the merger and acquisition template interacts with metadata.

33. (New) The computer program product of claim 32, wherein the metadata is included in at least one of a database and a repository in a persistence/repository layer.

(See Applicants' new claims 30-33, as filed with this amendment.)

Support for Applicants' new claims may be found at least at paragraphs [0064]-[0066] of the subject application, as published. Paragraph [0066] was provided above, and paragraphs [0064]-[0065] are provided below for the Examiner's convenience:

[0064] **The databases and repositories in the persistence/repository layer 610 can contain metadata. Metadata refers to data that describes other data, such as data pertaining to roles, work sets and personalization information, for example. The metadata can interact with the object access layer 608, connectivity layer 612 and application services logic 606. The metadata can also interact with templates 616.** The templates 616 provide a format or organization of information according to preset conditions. The templates 616 can interface with Web application server (WAS) processes 618 and core merger processes 620 in the repository layer 610. (See the subject application, as published, paragraph [0064]; emphasis added).

[0065] **In embodiments, the databases and repositories in the persistence/repository layer 610 interact with the source systems 614 through base system connectors 615 using a markup language such as extensible markup language (XML), web services such as Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), request for comments (RPC), or Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP).** The source systems of one organization can interact with the source systems of another organization through a firewall 617. (See the subject application, as published, paragraph [0065]; emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, whether viewed separately or in combination, do not disclose any of the limitations of Applicants' new claims 30-33. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 30-33 are in condition for allowance.

Having overcome all of the outstanding rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants believe that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the subject application is in condition for allowance. While Applicants respectfully assert that the subject application is now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (617-305-2129) to facilitate prosecution of this application. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 50-2324.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 20 September 2010

/V. Raman Bharatula/
V. Raman Bharatula
Reg. No. 66,255

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116-3889
Telephone: 617-305-2129
Facsimile: 617-523-6850

9771106_v1